some tough testing. The critics want it; they say this is too easy. Let us have some tough angles. You shot that pheasant going straight away. Have angles where they cross. Let us have some higher speeds; let us have some difficult geometries. Let us have some more difficult radar acquisition.

To do all of that, you have got to build a bigger test range. You cannot just have this narrow alley where you throw the same target up in the same position every time and you shoot it from the same position.

So we are now expanding this test range in this defense bill to Alaska, to a location at Fort Greely and a location at Kodiak, Alaska. So we are now going to have some very difficult shots.

It will also allow us to shoot-lookshoot. We will have multiple engagements. We throw up a missile, and if we miss it with first shot, we will try to get it with a second one. So we will have a chance to evaluate our success just seconds after we fired our first intercept; and, if we miss that intercept, we come back with a second intercept.

So President Bush has taken the challenge from all the naysayers that you talked about that said it does not work. A lot of the naysayers say we do not even want to test it. It is so unthinkable, we do not want to test it. That is no longer a reasonable position. That is why we need every penny of funding that the President has requested in this defense bill for missile defense.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I think what we also to have understand, if the President is successful in his strategy, missile defense will actually in the end cost us less, much less, than what President Reagan envisioned missile defense costing, because if President George W. Bush is successful, we will be working with the Russians, as Ronald Reagan had suggested we might do in a more peaceful world; and we could actually work with the Russians to build this shield. It would help bring down the cost. This is something that would make the world a lot safer.

But for us to just suggest that no country, that we could rely on this mutually assured destruction, which was a policy from the 1950s and 1960s, is so ridiculous. China or Korea, for example, you have regimes that murder their own people by the tens of thousands. Why do they care then if we would retaliate against them and kill 100,000 or 200,000 of their people? They do not care. That does not deter them at all.

Mr. HUNTER. We just had an attack by people who did not care about mutually assured destruction.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Absolutely. I would like to thank the gentleman for, number one, his leadership, and also for helping us recall that Bob Dornan played such an important role on issues like this and other defense issues that have made the country safer.

I am pleased to be standing here at your side now, and wish Bob a lot of success in his radio program that he has on, I guess, on a daily basis.

Mr. HUNTER. I want to thank my good friend for his contribution to this Special Order. I think it is appropriate that we started in southern California talking about Jerry Williams, who was a great cattleman and really carried forth a tradition and legacy of the West in his home and with his great family up in the Santa Ynez Valley where Ronald Reagan settled, and where you and I and Bob Dornan campaigned a number of times.

That was really, to some degree, the heart of the political movement that supported then Governor Reagan through a couple of campaigns for the U.S. Presidency and ended up with leadership in the 1980s that proved the validity of peace through strength. That is the idea that we in the United States would become so strong that we would be able to deter aggression. That means we could not only protect ourselves, but we could protect lots of others

\square 2300

We did a lot of great things for the world. We freed a lot of people. This little article from the New York Times about the President or the head of the Communist Sandinistas, former dictator of Nicaragua, being beaten in a free and fair election in Nicaragua is great evidence of the validity of the idea of peace through strength that we engendered in the 1980s.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let us note that for the record, I noted about a week ago on the Los Angeles Times editorial page, they had some leftist, as they always do, lamenting about Latin America and how horrible it was, this war in Latin America in which we stopped the Communists from taking over Latin America, and yes, it was certainly an imperfect war, and there never was a perfect war; innocent people were hurt and there were some unsavory characters on our side at times. But I say to the gentleman, there would be no democracy there; all of these countries would be like North Korea.

Mr. HUNTER. Or Cuba.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Or Cuba, if we would have lost then, but here we have in the L.A. Times, giving column inch after column inch to these old leftists who are proven wrong every time, and here again we have an election in Nicaragua where the people soundly reject everything this leftist was claiming about Latin America, everything he was claiming about Nicaragua, and the people down there do not believe a darned word of it.

But guess what? Guess what? The L.A. Times gives people like that all of that coverage, and they would not say a good word about Bob Dornan in his entire career. The L.A. Times would not give him one column inch. Detractors, yes. People who were espousing the virtues of the Sandinistas and

these people who would have enslaved the people of Latin America, the Communists, they get all of the space they need. Bob Dornan has never gotten a column inch.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is true. Daniel Ortega is probably sitting in an empty room right now in Nicaragua with an old copy of the Los Angeles Times predicting that he was going to win this election in one hand, and a "Dear Commandante" letter from the more liberal Members of this House of Representatives in the other hand, assuring him of his primacy. That is all he has left.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for participating. Mr. Speaker, God bless the family of Jerry Williams, God bless Bob Dornan and his family, and God bless Ronald Reagan and his family and the strength that he brought to our country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. LOFGREN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. McNulty (at the request of Mr. Gephardt) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. Burton of Indiana (at the request of Mr. Armey) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. Woolsey) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Brown of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

oday. Ms. KAPTUR. for 5 minutes. todav.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Lipinski, for 5 minutes, today. Mr. Liabson of Connecticut, for

Mr. Larson of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Schiff, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Kansas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to: